

THE SCOTT ACT REVIEWED

FOR THE BENEFIT OF FARMERS

And other Persons Interested.

At the present time, when so much is being said and done to deceive the Farmer in regard to the operations of the Scott Act, it becomes highly necessary that a plain and unvarnished statement in connection therewith should be placed in his hands, so that he might be able to determine for himself the best course to pursue—whether to oppose or support the adoption of the Act in this district. And in order to accomplish this object the more effectually we will now proceed to show how the operations of the Scott Act will affect our Agricultural population generally. In the first place, we may state that the census returns of 1881 show that the population of the whole Dominion was then 4,324,810, distributed according to provinces as follows:—

Prince Edward Island.....	108,891
Nova Scotia.....	440,572
New Brunswick.....	321,233
Province of Quebec.....	1,359,027
Ontario.....	1,923,228
Manitoba.....	65,954
British Columbia.....	49,450
North-West Territories.....	56,446
Total.....	4,324,810

The increase of population during the decade preceding the census of 1881 was within a fraction of seventy thousand a year, so that taking a somewhat higher ratio of increase for the past three years, we may very safely assume that the total population of the Dominion is now 4,600,000 souls. According to the last census the population of all the cities in the Dominion, and of towns having 5,000 inhabitants and upwards, was 560,110. If we add thereto their probable increase for the past three years, and the smaller town population, it may safely be assumed that the city and town population of the Dominion now stands at 700,000 souls, or a little over fifteen per cent of the whole total. And thus we see at a glance that the Agricultural or rural population of the Dominion stands to the population of the cities and towns in the proportion of within a fraction of six and a half to one, or in other words, of about 85 to 15 in every hundred. Those who take the trouble to

look closely into the matter, will find that the real and personal property of the country districts stands in very nearly the same ratio to the real and personal property of the cities and towns that the population does. Hence it will be seen at a glance, that the agricultural population of the Dominion constitutes its true backbone, both as regards numbers and real and personal property; and will be affected by its adversity or prosperity to a far greater extent than its city and town population combined. Let our farming friends bear these plain and easily understood facts well in mind.

The total revenue of the Dominion, according to the Public Accounts Blue Book for the fiscal year ending June 30th 1883, was \$36,803,668.95, derived from customs duties and various other sources. Of this revenue the amount accruing from the internal excise on spirits and malt liquors, and the customs duties on imported liquors, stood as follows:—

Excise on Spirits.....	\$3,862,099 84
“ Malt Liquor.....	5,434 32
“ Malt.....	401,905 89

Total Excise duties.....	\$4,269,440 05
Duties paid on imported Wines and liquors of various kinds.....	1,887,726 95

Total.....	\$6,157,167 00
------------	----------------

The revenue of the Province of Ontario during the year ending Dec. 31st, 1883, was as follows:—

Received from Dominion Government.....	\$1,333,569 42
Received from all other sources.....	1,357,715 57

Total revenue.....	\$2,691,284 98
--------------------	----------------

The expenditure of this Province during the same year was \$2,887,037 73, or \$195,752 75 more than the receipts. This deficiency the Ontario Government seeks to make good by imposing an additional duty on liquor licenses, so as to increase the revenue derived from that source from \$96,460 50 in 1883 to probably double that amount this year, as will be seen from the Act Chap. 35 passed at the last session of our Local Legislature. In addition to the revenue derived by the Ontario Government from liquor licenses it may be safely assumed that the various municipalities in the Province will receive \$600,000 more from the same source, making a total altogether of \$800,000, or about 40 cents per capita of the whole population, computed at two million of souls; and at the same ratio the whole Dominion would give a local government and municipal revenue, derived also from the same source, of \$1,840,000, which added to the Dominion revenue will show a total annual revenue of \$7,997,167, derived from the manufacture and importation of liquor and sale of licenses. And in this connection it should be remembered that a very considerable part of the spirits manufactured in this country is exported to France, Spain and Italy, to be used there to fortify brandy and various grades of wines, while the Canadian customs duties on wines, and on nearly all

other
wealth
wines
erable
which
annual
for t
may b
largel
and i
Le
and
Act
count
gener
and
that
the h
the co
If our
popul
pay e
They
and
direct
provi
mone
the s
count
have
the r
reven
only
porta
taxes
Bu
have
home
now
home
very
fatte
that
thos
emp
Shu
char
prop
will

other imported liquors, are not paid by the farmers but by the wealthy classes in cities and towns which chiefly consume those wines and liquors. The Farmer is therefore relieved of a considerable part of the burden of the Dominion expenditure, and of which part he would otherwise have to pay 85 per cent annually. As in the case of tobacco, which produced a revenue for the past fiscal year, of \$1,885,536, the duties on liquors may be regarded as a tax levied on the luxuries of life, and being largely paid by the rich falls lightly on the bulk of the community, and in point of fact makes less taxes for them to pay.

Let our farming friends sit down quietly, take up their pencils, and figure out the question for themselves. Suppose, the Scott Act people succeed in getting the Act adopted in a number of counties, and that they are thus placed in a position to go to the general government (as they state emphatically they design to do) and demand a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion, and get that law, who will have to make good (for made good it must be) the huge gap of nearly eight millions of dollars in the revenue of the country. Out of whose pockets will it come? That's the rub! If our agricultural population represent eighty-five per cent. of the population and property of the whole Dominion they will have to pay eighty-five cents in the dollar of the loss to the public revenue. They cannot get out of that financial box in any shape or form; and they will either have to make the deficiency good by direct taxation, or otherwise, as the wisdom of Parliament may provide; but made good it must be, as the Dominion requires the money to meet its fast increasing expenditure. And precisely in the same way eighty-five per cent of the direct loss sustained in any county, or group of counties, where the Scott Act is adopted, will have to be made good by the farmer, directly or indirectly, while the more wealthy classes who now pay a large proportion of the revenue derived from the Customs' duties on imported liquors will only have their share of the fifteen per cent to pay when that importation ceases, so that their taxes will be decreased, while the taxes of the Farmers will be increased in the same ratio.

But the direct loss is not the only one which the Farmer will have to sustain from the adoption of prohibition. He will lose a home market for all his bright barley, of which the Ontario Farmer now grows several million bushels annually. He will lose a home market, also, for his rye, and the loss in this way will take a very large sum annually from his pocket. Breweries and distilleries fatten a large amount of cattle for a foreign and home markets; that industry will disappear, and the farmer will lose the sale of those cattle. Breweries and distilleries give a large amount of employment, and represent a large amount of taxable property.—Shut them suddenly up, and the workmen will all have to be discharged, and can no longer buy food from the farmer; and the property becoming valueless will no longer pay taxes. The country will become so much the poorer; and the farmer will have to pay

eighty-five per cent of the loss, indirectly of course, but it will come out of his pocket all the same. And will whisky be kept out of the country? Not a bit of it! With some three thousand miles of Yankeedom lying along our Southern boundary, all the able-bodied men of the Dominion were they to be strung along that boundary, would not be able to keep whisky out of the country; while illicit stills would abound in every direction. At the same time, the whole community would be in constant turmoil, quarrels and disturbance would prevail from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and the terrible struggle would throw society back half a century. Strung as Canada is like a thin strip along the frontier of the United States, prohibition means the transfer of the liquor trade from this country to Uncle Sam's territories, and the cause of temperance would only recede instead of advancing, and because all influential public sentiment would soon cease to be at its back.

But farmers would suffer also in various other ways. When they travel to market now the country tavern gives them food for themselves, and accommodation for their horses, at very moderate rates. The Scott Act will close up all these places. In market towns farmers can get their dinner and a stall for their horses for twenty-five cents. When the Scott Act passes the town taverns will have to close up or double their rates, and the farmers will suffer no small inconvenience in this direction. But this is not all.—When the license revenue disappears, and the Scott Act comes to be enforced, and there will be no fund to enforce it, the License Inspectors' salaries and expenses will still have to be paid; and while the Ontario Government will only pay one-third of those expenses, the local tax-payers will have to pay the other two-thirds. And our farming friends will find also that they will have a good deal more to pay before they get through; and the question of direct taxation, not only for the Dominion but also for Provincial purposes, will be the burning one for them, by-and-bye, just as it is in the United States at this moment. Let prohibition become the law of the land, and the lightly taxed Canadian Farmer will no longer exist amongst us as hitherto. Out of the total loss to the public revenue, of some eight million dollars each year, Farmers will have to pay eighty-five per cent of the whole loss, or \$6,800,000, independent of various other burdens which must necessarily be imposed on the property of the country.

This article, designed for the information of our farming friends, is as long as our space will permit, and we must now bring it to a close. Our figures and statistics are all derived from Dominion or Ontario Blue Books, or from sources otherwise beyond dispute. We have made no attempt to cook them up in any way. We have endeavored to put them before our readers in the simplest and plainest form so that they might be easily understood, and we now leave our farming friends to work them all out for themselves, and to make up their minds what they had better do. Of one thing they may rest assured, and that is that Prohibition, local or general,

while it must lamentably fail to advance the cause of either religion or true temperance will terribly derange the finances of the whole country, will seriously retard its prosperity, and will set, in one way or another, the community by the ears. People cannot be made moral, or temperate, or religious, by proscriptive laws. Moral suasion and sound religious teaching can alone effect a true reformation now as in Apostolic times, and when clergymen abandon the example of their great Head in this respect, and essay to become the masters instead of the teachers of the community, they abandon their vantage ground, and will be sadly crushed by the reaction which will ensue sooner or later. This is the lesson which all history teaches.

The Scott Act and Prohibition

REVIEWED IN A LETTER TO THE "GLOBE,"

FROM CHARLES RICE, ESQ., OF PERTH,

CLERK OF THE CROWN,

PERTH, (Lanark), July 19th, 1884.

"The subject who is truly loyal to the Chief Magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures."—*Globe motto from "Junius."*

SIR,—It is evident from the movement set on foot in different parts of the country by the advocates of prohibitory liquor laws, that the Dominion of Canada has once more to pass through the ordeal of one of those waves of fanaticism which at different times, but with a certain degree of periodic fatality, and with varied measures of resultant evil to the people, have, at one time or another, swept over every civilized nation in the world. Well-meaning men, witnessing certain classes of evils among the people, become actuated by a laudable desire to remove those evils; and the evils of intemperance being probably more prominently noticeable than many others of much greater magnitude, naturally attract and invite the attention of those classes of minds unaccustomed to look beneath the surface of things, and who are dominated by emotional impulses rather than cool reason. Their mode of cure, originating in the emotions, becomes first a hobby, then a craze, and finally culminates in persecution and measures of arbitrary despotism. With the example of those before them, who adopted that most expeditious and effective mode of silencing a man who tells unpalatable truths by cutting off his head, they jump to the conclusion that the only

true cure for the existing intemperance is to stop the sale of spirituous liquor, forgetting that the manufacture and sale are but the inevitable outcome of the operation of the inexorable natural laws that regulate and govern supply and demand. So long as human nature craves and demands a stimulant, human beings will invent and manufacture one to meet that demand, all the Scott Acts and prohibition liquor laws in the world to the contrary notwithstanding. Let the demand cease and the supply will stop itself. No one will waste labour and capital in producing an article that nobody wants; but so long as everybody (or nearly everybody) wants it, somebody will produce it. To reason with men dominated by a hobby or a craze would be a sheer waste of time—as well try to reason a hypochondriac out of his delusion. I have no hope of influencing such men; but there are others just as well-meaning, upright, honest, and conscientious, if not more so, who may be induced to pause and think, ere committing themselves to the support of a system of sumptuary penal laws which, wherever tried, and under whatever name, have invariably produced vastly more evil than good.

The Scott Act prohibits the sale of spirituous liquors except (1) to druggists licensed to sell it again under certain restrictions, and (2) in quantities of not less than ten gallons to be forthwith removed out of the county, and any adjoining county in which the Scott Act is in force. The licensed druggists are permitted to sell in quantities of *not less* than one pint (1) on the requisition of a clergyman for sacramental purposes; (2) on the certificate of a physician for medical purposes; (3) on the certificate of two Justices of the Peace for mechanical purposes. And here the question naturally suggests itself. If the sale of spirituous liquors be such an unmitigated evil as the Scott Act assumes it to be, why submit the druggist and his clerks to the temptation of keeping large quantities of it in stock for sale? Are they not entitled to the protection of the law from the danger and temptation of becoming drunkards? Why sacrifice the poor druggist to save the poor gutter slums? The clergyman's certificate will procure an unlimited quantity of wine. What is to prevent him and his elders or deacons or trustees from ordering enough to supply all their private wants? The physician can procure any quantity of spirituous or fermented liquors on a certificate that it is required for medicinal purposes. What is to prevent the physician and his intimate friends in this way getting all the liquor they want? Two justices of the peace—the Scott Act only entrusts as much discretion in this matter to two justices as to one clergyman or one physician, which is rather hard on the justices, some of whom are respectable, honest men—but two justices can at any time procure a supply of the ardent by simply certifying that it is required for mechanical purposes. They can get a mechanic to join in the pool just to keep up appearances. But here a strange anomaly comes in. The certificate alone of justice number one is not worth the paper it is written on; the

certificate of justice number two is equally worthless ; but the two worthless certificates joined into one become good and valid authority for the sale of any quantity of spirits ? Two worthless nothings under Scott Act ethics become a very important something, and the whole contains vastly more than all its parts. If the joint certificate of two justices is sufficient to warrant the sale of a pint of spirits, why not simplify matters a little and make the certificate of one justice good for half a pint ? But then the whole gist and tenor of the Scott Act is directed against the danger of selling, not too much but too little ! It is not safe to sell a man less than a pint, but perfectly safe to sell him a barrel ! Scott Act logic limps badly. Again, if it is right to drink wine in church on Sunday, why is it wrong to drink it in the dining room or the hotel on Monday ? If it is right for a man to drink spirits with the sanction of a physician, why is it wrong to drink it with the sanction of a man's own judgment and conscience ? Why discriminate and allow clergymen, doctors, and justices to procure all the liquor they want, while all other classes are debarred the indulgence ? First banish wine and spirits from the churches and the druggists before undertaking to banish it from the the dining-rooms and hotels. First, pull the beam out of your own eye, and then you will see better how to pull the mote out of your brother's eye. In counties where the Scott Act is in force, distillers are allowed to manufacture and sell spirits in quantities not less than ten gallons, and brewers to make and sell beer in quantities not less than five gallons, to be forthwith removed out of the county, and out of any adjoining county in which the Scott Act is in force. If it is wrong to sell liquor for consumption in one county, on what principle of justice or equity can it be right to allow it to be sold for use in another county ? If it is wrong for the individual to buy liquor from the distiller or brewer in his own county (and the Scott Act declares it to be wrong), on what principle of justice can it be right for him to buy it from the distiller or brewer in another county, and bring it into his own for use ? Why drive the trade out of one county into another ? Why compel the inhabitants of one county to do all their trading in liquor in another county ? Why banish whiskey and beer from one county merely to deluge the inhabitants of another county with it ? On what principle of moral ethics can this phase of the Scott Act be justified.—Gentlemen, it won't do.

By a strange perversion of the very principle claimed to be at the bottom of prohibitory legislation, the minimum quantity allowed to be sold by a druggist under the Scott Act is limited to one pint, while the maximum is unlimited—the druggist cannot sell less than a pint to one person, but he can sell him a barrel ? How this system is calculated to promote temperance and sobriety baffles ordinary comprehensions. It won't do.

The Scott Act unjustly discriminates in favour of privileged classes. The doctor, the clergyman, and two justices and a mechanic (it always takes two justices and a mechanic to equal one doctor and

a sick man, or one clergyman, under Scott Act ethics) can get his ale, brandy, wine, gin, &c., as much as he wants and whenever he wants it; but the respectable, well-behaved, temperate, sober merchant, lawyer, trader, mason, farmer, teacher, carpenter, shoemaker, tailor, &c., is put to the humiliation of begging a certificate from a clergyman, a doctor, or two justices and a mechanic, before he can get a drop of spirits to rub on his wife's lame back or preserve her sweetmeats from spoiling. On what principles of equity can this unjust class privilege be justified? It won't do.

Again, the Act, like almost all sumptuary legislation, discriminates in favour of the rich man against the poor man. The rich man can purchase from the wholesale dealer at a distance where the Scott Act is not in force, his barrel of wine, ale, gin, brandy, &c., and bring it in and store it away in his cellar, and enjoy the luxuries and comforts of civilization, and make merry with his friends, all under the sanction of the Scott Act, while the poor man is driven to the humiliation of applying to a clergyman for a certificate, or pretending to the doctor that he is sick for a drink, or taking two justices and a mechanic into his confidence, before he can get even a pint of ale or wine to recruit his exhausted energies and cheer him up after a hard day's toil; for "wine cheereth God and man," (Judges ix, 13) and "maketh glad the heart of man," (Psalm civ., 15). It won't do.

That system of government and laws approaches the nearest to perfection which allows the widest liberty of individual choice and action, while it affords the best possible protection to person and property. It allows every citizen free choice of action, but holds him strictly responsible for the choice he makes, so far as it affects the rights and liberties of other citizens. The Scott Act takes away the liberty of choice, and aims to make men sober by rendering it impossible to get drunk, and thus fosters moral degeneracy by weakening and ultimately destroying self-reliance and self-control. The man who can get drunk if he chooses, and does not, possesses the virtues of temperance and sobriety, while the man who would get drunk if he could, but cannot, is already a drunkard in his heart, and will indulge in a debauch on the first opportunity. The inmates of the penitentiary are models of sobriety while they are there, because they are under restraint and cannot get drunk; but does not the restraint imposed on them weaken rather than strengthen their moral stamina and self-reliance? The Scott Act seeks to surround every county with a prison wall of law, so far as the use of spirituous liquor is concerned, by rendering it impossible for the inmates to get liquor, druggists, clergymen, doctors, two justices, and a mechanic always excepted; and every man who votes for the Scott Act places on record the fact that, in his own judgment, he is not fit to take care of himself—and probably in this matter he is not far astray—but it won't do.

One man in a hundred may be thriftless, improvident, untruthful, unreliable, gives free scope to the indulgence of his animal appetites

and passions, cares for nobody but himself, drinks liquor to excess, becomes a drunkard, injures himself and abuses his family, if he has one; and to save this incorrigible crank from the natural consequences of his own voluntary acts, and innate cussedness, prohibitionists would place under legal restraint the ninety-nine just persons who never drink to excess, and never get drunk, and deprive them of the enjoyments and comforts of life, the fruits of their own industry, economy, and good management. It won't do; and the ninety-nine will not tamely submit to such arbitrary tyranny and injustice. If prohibitionists choose to lead a life of total abstinence from the use of stimulants, let them do so—it is their own affair—but let them not arrogate to themselves the right to impose that restraint upon others who choose to live differently. The voluntary celibate might with equal justice claim the right to impose forced legal celibacy on the whole male population. It won't do.

The Scott Act makes it a crime for any person but a licensed druggist to sell liquor. But a sale always involves a purchase, and there can be no seller without a buyer; and when there are two parties to the commission of a crime, both should be punished alike; but the Scott Act metes out no such even-handed justice as that. It punishes the man who sells, yet says there is no harm in the sale as such, else why allow the druggist to sell; but with a strange perversity of moral sense truly deplorable, the man who buys and puts the liquor to a bad use, and does all the evil by indulging to excess in a mere sensuous gratification, is petted and sympathized with, and held held up to the public gaze as a perfect paragon of injured innocence. This morbid, sickly sentimentalism which is always lavished on unworthy objects, inflicts on society a vast amount of evil by giving genuine philanthropy a wrong direction.

It is not my intention to trespass on the ground taken up by Mr. Kyle in his articles in the *Globe* for some time past, further than this:—Mr. Kyle has challenged prohibitionists to quote from the Bible one solitary passage condemnatory of the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors, or in Scripture language wine and strong drink, and they have not done so, for the simple reason that they cannot. The Scriptures abound in warnings against intemperance, and denunciations against drunkenness, but nowhere is the manufacture and sale of wine and strong drink prohibited, and in this respect the Scripture and the Scott Act are in direct antagonism. The evil consequences of intemperance and drunkenness are vividly portrayed in the sacred writings, while temperance and sobriety are strongly inculcated and enjoined, and the blessings resulting therefrom are held up as inducements to lead a sober and temperate life. But, at the same time, perfect freedom of choice of action is left, and on his own shoulders rests the responsibility of the choice the man makes. If he eschews the evil and chooses the good, he reaps all the blessings resulting from a sober and temperate life; but if he gives himself up to wine and strong drink, he suffers all the evils resulting from a life of drunkenness and debauchery. Deprive

a man of his freedom of choice, and you at once relieve him of his responsibility. The forbidden fruit was left inside the walls of Eden, within easy reach of our first parents, where it could be seen by them every day, and they were warned of the evil consequences that would befall them if they touched it. But our modern prohibitionists, who imagine that they understand how to manage the affairs of this world so much better than the Moral Governor of the universe, would improve on this plan; they would never have committed so grave a mistake as to place the forbidden fruit inside the walls of Eden where it could be easily got at, but would have placed it outside the walls, or destroyed it altogether, and thus would have kept our first parents in a state of innocence by rendering it impossible for them to sin. That is the modern prohibition plan, but it is not the plan of the Moral Ruler of the world.

It is strange how men's judgments become perverted when their minds are dominated by a craze. This is pitifully illustrated in the replies to Mr. Kyle, published in the *Globe*, on the Bible wine question. Having adopted the theory that Christ ought not to have changed a large quantity of water into intoxicating liquor at the wedding in Cana, they at once conclude that morally he could not, and the transition is easy to the logical *non sequitur* that he did not. Instead of basing their theory on the preponderance of evidence, after a careful, unbiassed, and unprejudiced examination of all the facts and evidence, *pro* and *con*, they first form the theory and then twist and pervert the plain meaning of the language of the Scriptures to suit the theory. Had it not been for the exigencies of modern prohibition theories, the intoxicating quality of Bible wine never would have been called into question. Having made up their minds that the Bible ought to condemn the manufacture and sale of wine and strong drink, they jump to the conclusion that it must and does condemn it. When challenged to quote evidence in support of the assumption, they avoid the issue by asserting that the whole scope and tenor of the moral teaching of the Bible is condemnatory of the liquor traffic, or, in other words, that the Bible as a whole contains what is not contained in any of its parts. You carefully examine a basket of peaches, and find that it contains no apples among the peaches, and yet you maintain that the basket of peaches as a whole contains a large percentage of apple. Dearly beloved brethren, it won't do.

This saying of St. Paul (1 Cor. viii., 13) is often quoted in justification of a prohibitory liquor law:—"Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." Be it so. Every man and woman is at perfect liberty to refrain from eating meat as a matter of conscience to save an erring brother or sister; but would that justify the Government in passing a penal law to compel the whole people to refrain from eating meat? It won't do. Prohibitionists seem utterly incapable of drawing the distinction between voluntary abstinence and compulsory abstinence. A man may do voluntary a great many things that it would be rank injustice and tyranny to compel him to

do. It may be necessary to subject the unfortunate individual afflicted with dipsomania to a certain measure of restraint in order to wean him from his vicious habits and bring him back to temperance and sobriety ; but is that any reason why all the rest of the community, not so afflicted, should be subjected to what is tantamount to the same or similar restraint? The surgeon may find it necessary to amputate the "diseased limb" of his patient in order to save his life ; but would that justify him in amputating the healthy limbs of healthy people in order to save them from the possibility of becoming diseased? Why punish all virtuous people because some people are vicious, and all sober people because some people get drunk? It won't do.

Prohibitionists are in the habit of styling themselves temperance men. This is a misnomer. They are rather extremists, absolutists, pessimists or optimists. Temperance is defined by Webster as "moderation, sobriety, habitual moderation in regard to the indulgence of the natural appetites and passions, restrained or moderate indulgence." The difference between temperance as thus defined and prohibition is as wide as the Poles. Temperance is the mean between excess on the one hand and total abstinence on the other.—Where a prohibitory liquor law is enforced there can be no temperance.

In an editorial in a recent number of the *Globe* it is stated that the evils of intemperance are so great that the adoption of any measure, however extreme, is justifiable that will tend to abate these evils. This is going a little too far, and always is and always has been used to justify every act of arbitrary tyranny that has ever been committed. The end does not always justify the means, and a Government even has no right to do wrong. The majority have no more right to compel the minority to eat and drink certain things, or to refrain from eating and drinking certain things, than they have to compel them to go to a particular church on Sunday. It won't do.

What a vast amount of morbid sympathy and sentimental gush is wasted on the ideal drunkard. This mythical being, who is as different from the real article as day is from night, is exhibited on the prohibition platform in all the gorgeous colouring of a fervid and heated imagination in order to excite the morbid sympathies of a class of people who flow over on hearing or reading a harrowing tale of fiction as easily and naturally as a kitchen swill-pail. Yet these same individuals who expend so much gush on the platform will pass by on the other side lest their sacred persons should be contaminated by lending a helping hand to the poor unfortunate inebriate who lies wallowing in the gutter. It is so much easier to cure, or rather to affect to cure, the evils of intemperance by displays of platform oratory and Acts of Parliament than by actual deeds of charity and benevolence ; but it won't do.

I, being opposed to every form of tyranny over the mind of man, denounce the Scott Act as one of the most arbitrary and tyrannical measures outside despotic Russia, and "the subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures.

Perth, July 19th.

C. RICE.

THE SCOTT ACT REVIEWED

In a Letter from a Clergyman to the Daily "Mail."

SIR,—To the sour reformers who having become "virtuous" would stop other people's "cakes and ale," I do not address my words; but rather to that large class of persons who would adopt any measures that justice allowed, provided there were a reasonable hope of success in diminishing the great evil of excessive drinking. In your columns I reach many readers of this class, and am thankful for the privilege. I will confine myself in this letter to merely prudential considerations, designing to notice some higher ones further on.—

1. To expatiate on the evils of drunkenness is beside the mark. I sincerely deplore them, and I deplore the great pecuniary waste entailed; but I deny at the outset that the great sums which this drinking costs are to be all set down to the score of drunkenness.—This is constantly done by temperance orators, but it is a mere slander. Take, for example, the case of Mr. Gladstone. He drinks daily half a pint of claret and a glass of port, though Sir Andrew Clark, a famous authority of our extremists, is his friend and physician. Now this must be called really moderate drinking, yet it amounts in a year to half a hogshead of claret and ten or a dozen gallons of port, the cost of which makes a pretty contribution for one individual to the national drink bill, and I for one feel sure that the great financier makes a wise expenditure. But the same defence is to be made for a large proportion of those who drink, whether wine, beer or spirits. However great the number of drunkards, they are really but few compared with the moderate and abstemious, and many a man of those who are given to occasional excess may not drink as much in the year as a strictly sober man whose dietary includes a very moderate quantum of drink. So that the residuum that strictly belongs to excess is a very much smaller figure, thank God, than is so hastily imagined. Of course if my neighbour thinks it is all excess—well and good; let him have his opinion; but I decidedly object to his making me conform to it by force. I do not believe that ten lines in a statute book can crush vice and make virtue triumphant. Were it so, how easily could the evils of humanity be remedied. I maintain that we shall but intensify drunkenness by putting the Scott Act in force. Nothing is easier in this day of easy communication than to obtain from outside the county ample supplies for all who can afford them; and for poorer people it is just as easy if they choose to club their contributions. There can be no doubt they will do this; and look at the result. In the case of such as are not sots, but given to occasional excess, will not the temptation from having drink in a large quantity at hand be likely to prove more dangerous than an occasional visit to the tavern? In many cases will not the drinking be continuous, and so destructive? Here is a case in point from the report of the Main Law Statistical Society

Mail."

us" would
ords; but
measures
pe of suc-
In your
al for the
ridential
er on.—
mark. I
waste en-
which this
nness.—
s a mere
le drinks
Andrew
d physi-
yet it
ozen gal-
n for one
that the
sfence is
er wine,
hey are
temious,
ess may
dietary
esiduum
ank God,
nks' it is
decided-
believe
true tri-
nity be
ness by
of easy
ple sup-
just as
o doubt
such as
ptation
o prove
n many
? Here
Society

of a former period :—" Fatal result of evading the Maine Liquor Law." A son-in-law went to New York, soon after the 1st of August, procured fifteen gallons of liquor, allowed his father-in-law all he wished, and in about six weeks carried him to his grave."—

2. An illicit trade in drink is another certain consequence of the Scott Act, and this is immeasurably worse in its effects than the present imperfectly regulated trade of licensed houses. It is purely preposterous to think that in the absence of an organized and costly police force this illicit trade can be prevented, especially in rural localities. Here is an example of many years ago from the *New Haven Palladium* : "A labourer remarked the present week to one of our merchants that he knew of twenty-three places in one short street where liquor was sold." Quite lately a gentleman whom I know and can trust, whose business takes him to the original home of the Scott Act, informed me that as much liquor of every sort as you want can be obtained in every town; and in one little town of Maine he learned from those in the secrets of the place that there were twenty-six places where liquor was sold, with the accompaniment of much worse things. I chanced upon lately, in a letter of Mr. King Dodds' to the *Globe*, the statement professedly taken from authorized reports, which are named, that the arrests for drunkenness in the towns of Maine are far in excess of those in places where the trade is legal, while the morality of the State has deteriorated. If this be true, it is enough; if not true it should be distinctly disproved. Then add to this the certainly deleterious character of the liquor that will be sold, and the increased moral and physical disadvantages may be inferred.

3. Another still more pernicious result is to be anticipated, in the diminished respect for law. By a large minority the law will be felt to be unjust and oppressive, the outcome of a misguided zeal, and it will most certainly be largely evaded. There can hardly be a graver evil than thus undermining the popular respect for the sanctity of law unless it be the lying, hypocrisy, and systematic chicanery which will be fostered extensively, to the horrible demoralization of the community. Now the trade houses are open to inspection, and subject to the various restraints of authority and public sentiment; and many evils are kept within bounds, and more could be with proper effort. But under the prohibitory act the disease will not be stamped out, but driven inwards, to the peril of the patient's life.

4. Again, an enforced abstinence will from time to time be broken through, especially in travelling outside, and many will, in sheer rebellion, drink all the more fiercely for the restraint; and thus the traffic will be kept up. I have known myself some melancholy cases of this sort.

5. Is the social bitterness that must spring up from this law of no account? Look now at the mere advocacy of it, and what monstrous uncharitableness does it everywhere engender towards any who so much as speak against it; and when we have a general espionage, always hateful in a free country, and one-half of the population enforcing the legal observance on the other half, is the morality of the

country likely to be advanced ? It will give rise to a new sort of factionism, immensely embittering our present political strifes. It is an open declaration of war ; for the advocates of the Act every where, in newspapers and conferences, declare it to be but a stepping-stone to the total suppression of the trade in intoxicants.

6. If this end be attained, the craving for stimulants will find other vents and more dangerous means of gratification. We shall have noxious drugs in use, in regard to which let one word suffice—China ! where opium is such a terrible curse. 7. For the present I must stop with the mention of one other serious mischief. The efforts of religious and philanthropic people will be much discouraged. Any man of intelligence knows how wide, and various, and successful are those efforts in England. Nothing can be more cheering than the thought of them. In Canada much is being done in the same direction ; but adopt this Act and you inevitably chill the zeal of benevolent labourers in the true reform of voluntary abstinence. And you do what is enormously worse—you deaden the efforts at self-help. The occasional offender against sobriety feels, it may be vaguely, that the great lesson he has to learn is to use without abusing : but this law destroys the spring of right within him. It puts him on the level with the savage Indian of the North-West or, with a brute beast, and denies him the opportunity of showing that there is anything better in him. For the sake of a handful of sots whom nothing will elevate, a whole class are degraded. Short and easy methods in morals never succeed ; and if this foolish law were to succeed in its aim, it would be an evil worse than drunkenness ; for a people would be thus taught to lean on the rotten reed of external enactments, and so the very foundations of right would be sapped, and the springs of all moral action destroyed.—The remedy would be worse than the disease, and we should have dearly purchased an external sobriety at the price of true freedom and the sense of the moral worth of man.

Yours, &c.,

JOHN CARRY.

Port Perry, 30th June, 1884.

THE SCOTT ACT AND CRIME.

The one great argument with the advocate of a Prohibitory Law is that it not only prevents drinking habits, but also reduces very materially the commission of serious crime of all kinds. Statistics, however, of the most reliable character prove that prohibitory laws do not bring about results of this satisfactory nature, and these Statistics can only be had in those States of the American Union where laws of this description have been in force for a series of years. In the State of Maine, for example, for the 24 years before the passage of a prohibitory law, that is from 1827 to 1851, there were 2026 persons committed to the State penitentiary, or an average of 81 for

each year. The record for the next 30 years, that is from 1852 to 1882, shows that under a prohibitory law 4157 convicts were sent into the State penitentiary, or an average for each year of 134.— During this long period there has been but little increase in the population of Maine. In 1851 it stood at 587,680, and in 1880, the date of the last United States census, it had only increased to 648,945. During those thirty years while the increase in population was not quite ten per cent, the increase of serious crime was nearly seventy per cent. In Alabama the convicts number 1 to each 1,930 of the population ; in Nebraska 1 to 1,800 ; in Florida 1 to 1,911 ; in Louisiana 1 to 1,595 ; in Wisconsin 1 to 1,486 ; in Illinois 1 to 1,494 ; in Indiana 1 to 1,607 ; in Minnesota 1 to 2,159 ; in Arkansas 1 to 1,540 ; West Virginia 1 to 1,659 ; while in the prohibitory State of Maine, the proportion of convicts is 1 to each 1,508 of the population, and in Vermont (the adjoining State) 1 to each 1,406. Chicago, probably one of the most dissolute cities in the United States, in one year had 18,000 arrests for drunkenness, in a population of 600,000, or about 1 to 33 of its inhabitants ; while in Portland, the principal city of Maine, the arrests for drunkenness during the same year was in the proportion of about 1 to every 23. These figures, all drawn from public documents, show most conclusively that prohibition does not change people's moral nature and make them better, nor diminish crime.

The advocates of a prohibitory law also claim that it increases national as well as individual prosperity, and prevents pauperism. Statistics, however, most emphatically disprove this theory. While the population of the whole United States has increased during the ten years from 1870 to 1880 at the rate of thirty-three per cent, Maine increased only at the rate of three per cent ; and in 1880 she showed, as regards pauperism, the worst record of any State in the Union. Look for example at the following figures :

	Population in 1880.	Number of Pau- pers in 1880.
Iowa.....	1,624,615	2,133
Indiana	1,978,301	3,965
Michigan.....	1,636,937	2,300
Minnesota	780,773	496
New Jersey.....	1,131,116	2,981
Maine.....	648,936	3,211

With a smaller population than Minnesota, Maine has over six times as many paupers as that State. With a population larger by almost a million than that of Maine, Iowa has only 2,133 paupers, or 1,078 less than Maine. Michigan is ahead of Maine in point of population by nearly one million, but the latter State takes the palm in point of pauperism by 911.

In Michigan after an experience of for about a quarter of a century of a prohibitory law, it was found to be a complete failure, as it only filled the country with unlicensed liquor sellers, was therefore repealed, and a stringent license law substituted therefor,

which gives infinitely more satisfaction. In the State of Massachusetts the evil effects of prohibitory legislation became so marked that in May, 1867, a joint special Committee of the Senate and Legislature sent out invitations to leading citizens of the Commonwealth to come before them and testify to the working of the law in their respective localities. In response to the invitation 183 prominent citizens went before the Committee; of this number, 108 condemned the prohibitory law in the strongest manner. On the list of dissentients there were thirty-four Ministers of the Gospel, all of whom, with rare unanimity, testified to the increased drunkenness it had inaugurated in their respective parishes. Of the seventy-five who still expressed a favorable opinion of prohibition, only twenty-four were clergymen. The weight of evidence was, therefore, strongly in favor of a stringent license law, and the Committee on the part of the Senate and the Legislature closed their report in the following words:—"As good citizens, whose only interest is to promote the highest good of the State, we should not be deterred by prejudice or pride of opinion, or the mistaken judgments of good men from reforming in season a law unsound in theory and bad in practice." Gentlemen of distinguished names were among the most prominent witnesses, who, from their daily experience during many years, were induced to come forward and testify to the evil effects of prohibitory legislation. In the language of several of the most noted clergymen, the effect of the law had been "To largely increase home drinking, and introduce the tippling habit to the notice of wives and children."

In the City of Boston alone the arrests for being drunk and disorderly during the years of prohibition averaged about eighteen thousand per annum, while under a license law (although the population of the city has largely increased) the average does not rise above fourteen thousand per annum; and from a report made to the governor of the State in November, 1878, we learn that the arrests for drunkenness in the whole State of Massachusetts during the year 1874 (*under prohibition*) numbered 28,044, and in 1877 (*license law*) the number was reduced to 20,657.

With these facts before them the people of Canada should certainly pause before they vote to impose the Scott Act on their country.